UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/695,669 | 10/29/2003 | Hiroyuki Yamakita | 61352-053 | 4068 |
| 7590 08/09/2007 MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 600 13th Street, N.W. | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | THOMAS, BRANDI N | |
| Washington, D | C 20005-3096 | • | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2873 | |
| | , | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/09/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/695,669 | YAMAKITA ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Brandi N. Thomas | 2873 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status (251 b) 2014 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| · <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) | <u>d 58</u> is/are withdrawn from consid | deration. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 16 April 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11. | ☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ■ All b) ■ Some * c) ■ None of: 1. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ■ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) ☐ Notice of Informal F 6) ☑ Other: <u>Detailed Act</u> | ate Patent Application | | | | |

Art Unit: 2873

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 42-45, 48-50, 52-55, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigehiro et al. in view of Takehiro (10-154603).

Regarding claim 42, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120) comprising: a pair of substrates (10 and 11) disposed opposite to each other, at least one of which is transparent (col. 5, lines 25-28); a plurality of particles (13 and 14) having an electrostatic property contained in a gaseous phase provided between the pair of substrates (10 and 11) (col. 4, lines 8-16 and col. 13, lines 46-50); first and second electrodes (403 and 404) provided for each of pixels arranged in a matrix for driving the particles (13 and 14) (col. 7, lines 32-40); and a voltage applying portion (402 and 405) for applying voltage to the first and second electrodes (403 and 404) in accordance with an image signal (col. 7, lines 41-47), and when voltage is applied to the first and second electrodes (403 and 404) by the voltage applying portion (402 and 405), the particles (10 and 11) are caused to travel between the first and second electrodes (403 and 404) in accordance with the voltage applied so as to display an image to the image signal (col. 7, lines 41-47) but does not specifically disclose wherein the particles each comprise a parent particle as a core, and plural child particles fixed to the parent particle in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the parent particle. Takehiro discloses, in figure

Art Unit: 2873

3, wherein the particles (14) each comprise a parent particle (13) as a core, and plural child particles (11) fixed to the parent particle (13) in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the parent particle (13) (section 0016). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the device of Shigehiro et al. with the parent particles of Takehiro for the purpose of reducing resistance (section 0016).

Regarding claim 43, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120), wherein the plurality of particles (10 and 11) comprise two kinds of particles (black and white) which are electrostatically charged to have different polarities (col. 5, lines 28-30) but does not specifically disclose at least one of the two kinds of particles comprising a parent particle as a core, and plural child particles fixed to the parent particle in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the parent particle. Takehiro discloses, in figure 3, wherein the particles (14) each comprise a parent particle (13) as a core, and plural child particles (11) fixed to the parent particle (13) in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the parent particle (13) (section 0016). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the device of Shigehiro et al. with the parent particles of Takehiro for the purpose of reducing resistance (section 0016).

Regarding claims 44 and 57, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120) comprising: a pair of substrates (10 and 11) disposed opposite to each other, at least one of which is transparent (col. 5, lines 25-28); a plurality of particles (13 and 14) having an electrostatic property contained in a gaseous phase provided between the pair of substrates (10 and 11) (col. 4, lines 8-16 and col. 13, lines 46-50); first and second electrodes (403 and 404) provided for each of pixels arranged in a matrix for driving the particles (13 and 14) (col. 7, lines

Art Unit: 2873

32-40); and a voltage applying portion (402 and 405) for applying voltage to the first and second electrodes (403 and 404) in accordance with an image signal (col. 7, lines 41-47), and when voltage is applied to the first and second electrodes (403 and 404) by the voltage applying portion (402 and 405), the particles (10 and 11) are caused to travel between the first and second electrodes (403 and 404) in accordance with the voltage applied so as to display an image to the image signal (col. 7, lines 41-47) but does not specifically disclose wherein the particles each comprise a parent particle as a coating an entire surface of the core, a first coating layer parent particle and comprising a material having a higher softening point than that of the parent particle, a second coating layer coating an entire surface of the first coating layer and comprising the same material as that of the parent particle or a material having a lower softening point than that of the parent particle, and plural child particles fixed to the second coating layer in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the second coating layer. Takehiro discloses, in figure 3, wherein the particles (14) each comprise a parent particle (13) as a core, and plural child particles (11) fixed to the parent particle (13) in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the parent particle (13) (section 0016), a first coating layer parent particle (13) and comprising a material having a higher softening point than that of the parent particle (section 0016), a second coating layer coating an entire surface of the first coating layer and comprising the same material as that of the parent particle or a material having a lower softening point than that of the parent particle (section 0016), and plural child particles (11) fixed to the second coating layer in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the second coating layer (section 0016). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2873

invention was made to combine the device of Shigehiro et al. with the parent particles of Takehiro for the purpose of reducing resistance (section 0016).

Regarding claim 45, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120) but does not specifically disclose wherein the parent particle has a smaller specific gravity and a lower softening point that the child particles. Takehiro discloses, in figure 3, wherein the particles (14) each comprise a parent particle (13) as a core, and plural child particles (11) fixed to the parent particle (13) in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the parent particle (13) (section 0016). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the device of Shigehiro et al. with the parent particles of Takehiro for the purpose of reducing resistance (section 0016).

Regarding claim 48, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120) but does not specifically disclose wherein either or both of the parent particles and the child particles are spherical. Takehiro discloses, in figure 3, wherein the particles (14) each comprise a parent particle (13) as a core, and plural child particles (11) fixed to the parent particle (13) in a manner to cover a substantially entire surface of the parent particle (13) (section 0016). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the device of Shigehiro et al. with the parent particles of Takehiro for the purpose of reducing resistance (section 0016).

Regarding claim 49, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120) but does not specifically disclose wherein the child particles each comprise fine particles of silica surface –treated to have an electrostatic property. Takehiro. discloses, in figure 3, wherein the child particles each comprise fine particles of silica surface –treated to have an electrostatic

Art Unit: 2873

property (sections 0016 and 0017). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the device of Shigehiro et al. with the parent particles of Takehiro. for the purpose of reducing resistance (sections 0016 and 0017).

Regarding claim 50, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120), wherein the child particles are colored particles (col. 5, lines 28-30).

Regarding claim 52, Shigehiro et al. and Takehiro disclose a display device (120) but does not specifically disclose wherein the child particles are we-milled, while Takehiro does not disclose the particles being wet-milled by a mill using a milling medium, this limitation is considered to be a product by process see MPEP 2113) and consequently does not provide any structural limitation beyond the particles disclosed by Shigehiro et al. and Takehiro.

Regarding claim 53, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120), wherein the childe particles are titanium oxide particles having an average particles diameter not less than 200 nm and not more than 400 nm (col. 6, lines 3-9).

Regarding claim 54, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figure 6b, a display device (120), wherein one of the two kinds of particles comprises black particles and negatively charged child particles are adhering to the black particles (figure 6b).

Regarding claim 55, Shigehiro et al. discloses, in figures 12 and 13, a display device (120), wherein the childe particles are silica particles having an average particles diameter not less than 10 nm and not more than 20 nm (col. 6, lines 31-37).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 42-45, 48-50, 52-55, and 57 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2873

Page 7

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Brandi N. Thomas whose telephone number is 571-272-2341.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ricky Mack can be reached on 571-272-2333. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandi N Thomas

Examiner

Art Unit 2873

. BNT

July 19, 207

CHEED WOOD WATERIT EVALUATION